

MARTIN D. SINGER (SBN 78166)

[mdsinger@lavelysinger.com](mailto:mdsinger@lavelysinger.com)

MICHAEL E. WEINSTEN (SBN 155680)

[mweinsten@lavelysinger.com](mailto:mweinsten@lavelysinger.com)

MELISSA Y. LERNER (SBN 285216)

[mlerner@lavelysinger.com](mailto:mlerner@lavelysinger.com)

**LAVELY & SINGER**

**PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION**

2049 Century Park East, Suite 2400

Los Angeles, California 90067-2906

Telephone: (310) 556-3501

Attorneys for Defendant

BIG GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ASHA DANIELS, an Individual,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BIG GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC., a  
Delaware Corporation; CAPS  
PAYROLL, an unknown California  
Business Organization; MELISSA  
JEFFERSON (aka "LIZZO"), as an  
Individual; CARLINA GUGLIOTTA, as  
an Individual; AMANDA NOMURA, as  
an Individual, and DOES 1 through 10,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-03571 FLA (PVCx)  
[Hon. Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha]

**[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT  
GRANTING DEFENDANT BIG  
GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC.'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, PARTIAL  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. #57]**

Date: August 22, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Hon. Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha

Courtroom: 6B

1 On July 18, 2025 Defendant BIG GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC. (“BGBT” or  
2 “Defendant”) filed its Motion for Summary Judgment (the “Motion”). (ECF No. 57.)  
3 Defendant requests summary judgment on the basis that judgment for Defendant is  
4 appropriate as a matter of law because the uncontroverted facts do not establish the  
5 essential elements of Plaintiff’s seven remaining claims for relief against Defendant and,  
6 with respect to Plaintiff’s fifth claim for relief for failure to engage in the interactive  
7 process, no such stand-alone claim exists under the ADA as a matter of law.

8 The Court, having and considered Defendant’s Motion and finding good cause  
9 therefor, hereby GRANTS the Motion and ORDERS as follows:

- 10 1. Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment is granted as to the entirety of  
11 the operative Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 3-1 at pp. 326-73)  
12 (“SAC”), namely the following claims for relief (styled as “causes of  
13 action”) asserted by Plaintiff against Defendant in the SAC: the first claim  
14 for relief for hostile work environment – sexual harassment in violation of  
15 Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”); second claim for  
16 relief for racial harassment and discrimination in violation of Title VII;  
17 third claim for relief for disability discrimination in violation of the  
18 Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”); fourth claim for relief  
19 for failure to accommodate in violation of the ADA; fifth claim for relief  
20 for failure to engage in the interactive process in violation of the ADA;  
21 sixth claim for relief for retaliation in violation of Title VII; and seventh  
22 claim for relief for retaliation in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.
- 23 2. Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated:

26  
27 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
28 United States District Judge